



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/611,913	07/07/2000	Clifford E. Kahn	EMC00-03(00011)	7737

7590

02/23/2004

Barry W Chapin Esq
Chapin & Huang LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER

COLIN, CARL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/611,913

Applicant(s)

KAHN, CLIFFORD E.

Examiner

Carl Colin

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 July 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Pursuant to USC 131, claims 1-45 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 3, line 30, "also" should be replaced with --allows-- . On page 6, line 15, "To" should be replaced with --The--. On page 7, line 26, the second "if" should be replaced with --it--. Appropriate correction is required.

Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the application.

- 2.1 The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is too lengthy. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Art Unit: 2136

2.2 The use of the trademark "SYMETRIX" on page 19, lines 26-27 and page 31, line 4, "ORACLE" on page 32, line 15 has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Drawings

3. Figure 7 is objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because it includes the reference number "424" not mentioned in the description.

In figure 6, step 403 there is a typo error in the word "applicable". Appropriate correction is required.

A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. **Claim 22 and the intervening claims** are objected to because of the following "the computer system of claim 18" Appropriate correction is required to avoid rendering the claims indefinite.

Art Unit: 2136

4.1 **Claim 37** is objected to because of the following informalities: line 28, the phrase “is allowed access the resource” is missing the word to after access.

Claim 43 is objected to because of the following informalities: the end of line 14, “of:.” has an extra colon.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 2136

5.1 **Claims 1-45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,236,996 to **Bapat et al.**

5.2 **As per claims 1, 19, and 38, Bapat et al.** discloses a method and a system (see figure 3) that meets the recitation of the system of claim 19 comprising input/output interface, processor, memory system encoding with authorization program, authorization database, and interconnection mechanism coupling the above list, for providing access control in a computing system environment, the method comprising the steps of receiving an access request (see column 11, lines 59); selecting, based on the access request, a selected set of rules containing at least one rule from at least one master set of rules (see column 11, lines 59-65 and column 13, lines 15-57); and performing at least one rule operation in the at least one rule in the selected set of rules to produce an access control decision until at least one of: i) a rule operation including a disregard instruction is performed to limit performance of rule operations in the selected set of rules; and ii) all rule operations in the selected set of rules that are applicable to the access control decision are performed. (See column 11, lines 59-65 and column 13, lines 15-57).

As per claims 2 and 20, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein the step of performing includes the step of producing an access control decision indicating whether to allow access, on behalf of a requestor submitting the access request, to an resource in the computing system environment (see column 11, lines 59-65 and column 13, lines 15-57).

As per claims 3 and 21, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein the step of selecting includes the steps of determining an identity of the resource in the computing system environment to which access is requested in the access request; and applying at least one filter operation, using the identity of the resource, for rules in the at least one master set of rules to produce the selected set of rules for use in determining the access control decision to the resource (see column 14, lines 10-42).

As per claims 4 and 22, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of further including the step of determining a role identity of a requestor submitting the access request (see column 15, lines 23-28 and column 16, lines 55-58); and wherein the step of applying applies the at least one filter operation, using the role identity of the requestor submitting the access request in combination with the identity of the resource, for rules in the at least one master set of rules to produce the selected set of rules for use in determining the access control decision to the resource (see column 14, line 53 through column 15, line 10; see also column 16, line 55 through column 17, line 41).

As per claims 5, 23, and 40, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein at least one rule in the selected set of rules contains a rule operation including an unconditional disregard instruction (see column 11, lines 11-23); and wherein the step of performing includes the steps of performing less than all rule operations defined within the at least one rule in the selected set of rules by sequentially performing rule operations in each rule in the selected set of rules until the unconditional disregard instruction is performed thereby terminating the performance of any

Art Unit: 2136

remaining rule operations in the selected set of rules (see column 15, lines 28-34 and column 11, lines 11-23). (See also column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

As per claims 6 and 24, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein the selected set of rules is arranged hierarchically such that rules containing rule operations that are more specific are performed before rule operations that are more general (see column 15, lines 28-34 and column 11, lines 11-23).

As per claims 7, 10, 25, 28, and 41, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein at least one rule in the selected set of rules contains a rule operation including a disregard instruction including disregard criteria; and wherein the step of performing limits performance of rule operations in the selected set of rules by performing the disregard instruction containing disregard criteria such that at least one rule operation in any remaining rule operations in the selected set of rules is disregarded from further performance (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28). (See also column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

As per claims 8, 11, 26, and 29, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein the step of performing includes the steps of evaluating the disregard criteria against any remaining unperformed rule operations in the selected set of rules; and marking any remaining unperformed rule operations in the selected set of rules that match the disregard criteria to be disregarded from further rule processing (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28).

As per claims 9, 27, and 39, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein the step of selecting includes the steps of determining an identity of a resource in the computing system environment to which access is requested in the access request (see column 26, lines 30-40); and applying at least one filter operation, using the identity of the resource, for rules in the at least one master set of rules to produce the selected set of rules for use in determining the access control decision to the resource (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28); and wherein the method further includes the step of determining a role identity of a requestor submitting the access request (see column 26, lines 30-40); and wherein the step of performing sequentially processes each rule operation in the selected set of rules using the role identity of the requestor submitting the access request in combination with the identity of the resource to determine if the requestor using the role identity can access the resource (see also column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

As per claims 12 and 30, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein the selected set of rules is arranged hierarchically such that rules containing rule operations that are more specific are performed before rules containing rule operations that are more general such that placement of the disregard instruction in one of the at least one rules in the selected set of rules causes the step of performing to control an amount of access control provided to the requestor that submitted the access request for access to the resource (see column 15, lines 28-34 and column 11, lines 11-23; see also column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

As per claims 13 and 31, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein the disregard instruction is a conditional instruction that has a condition that must be met before the disregard instruction is performed (see column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

As per claims 14 and 32, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein at least one rule in the selected set of rules contains a relation that defines a condition based on a group definition; and wherein at least one of the steps of selecting and performing includes the step of performing the relation to determine if at least one of a requestor, an access, and a resource specified in the access request satisfy the condition based on the group definition (see column 26, lines 30-67).

As per claims 15, 33, and 43, Bapat et al. discloses method for determining an authorization state of an access control system in a computing system environment, the method comprising the steps of receiving an access request (see column 27, lines 45-49); determining at least one of: i) an identity of the resource in the computing system environment to which the access request is directed (see column 26, lines 30-40); and ii) a role identity of a requestor submitting the access request; and applying at least one filter operation, based on at least one of the identity of the resource and the role identity of a requestor, to an at least one master set of rules to produce a list of rules to which the at least one filter operation matches in order to provide an indication of the authorization state of an access control system in a computing system environment as related to at least one of the identity of the resource and the role identity of a requestor (see column 26, lines 30-40 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

As per claims 16 and 34, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein the step of applying at least one filter operation applies a filter operation to determine what rules in the at least one master set of rules affect access to what resource in the computing system environment (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

As per claims 17, 35, and 42, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein the step of applying at least one filter operation applies a filter operation to determine what rules in the at least one master set of rules affect what at least one requestor can do to at least one resource in the computing system environment (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

As per claims 18 and 36, Bapat et al. discloses the limitation of wherein the step of applying at least one filter operation applies a filter operation to determine access control operations that a requestor can do to at least one resource in the computing system environment (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

As per claims 37 and 44, Bapat et al. discloses method providing access control to an resource in a computing system environment, the method comprising the steps of receiving an access request from a requestor requesting access to a resource in the computing system environment and determining a role identity associated with the requestor requesting access to the resource (see column 26, lines 30-40); and processing the access request in relation to a rule

Art Unit: 2136

set based on an identity of the resource in the computing system environment to which the requestor requested access and based on the role identity associated with the requestor to determine if the requestor is allowed access the resource (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.); and wherein the rule set includes a plurality of rules, each rule including a filter operation, and wherein the step of processing determines if a rule applies to the resource in the computing system environment to which the requestor requested access based on the filter operation (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.); and wherein at least one rule in the rule set includes a disregard instruction, and wherein if the step of processing determines, based on the filter operation that the rule including the disregard instruction applies to the resource in the computing system environment to which the requestor requested access, the step of processing processes the rule including the disregard instruction to limit performance of any remaining rule operations in the selected set of rules (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

As per claim 45, Bapat et al. discloses a method for controlling applicability of rule operations in a rule-based access control system, the method comprising the step of selecting at least one rule for performance to determine an access control decision; and performing a rule operation in the at least one rule, the rule operation including a disregard instruction that when performed, causes non-performance of at least one other rule operation in at least one rule that is selected for performance to determine the access control decision (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

Art Unit: 2136

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as the art discloses the use of filter to control access by users at clients in the network to information resources.

US Patent: 6,408,336 Schneider et al.

6.1 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 703-305-0355. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

cc

Carl Colin

Patent Examiner

February 18, 2004


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100